

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 1-3, 6-10, and 13-20 were pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 2, 8 and 9 are independent. In the Office Action dated July 6, 2004, Claims 1-3, 6, 8-10, 13, and 15-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and Claims 7, 14, 17, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Following this response, Claims 1-3, 6-10, and 13-20 remain in this application. Applicants hereby address the Examiner's rejections in turn.

I. Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

In the Office Action dated July 6, 2004, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-3, 6, 8-10, 13, and 15-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,949,877 ("*Traw*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 1 and 2 are patentably distinguishable over the cited art in that they each recite, for example, "the controller sends a key needed for a content exchange to the electronic device." Furthermore, Claims 8 and 9 are patentably distinguishable over the cited art in that they each recite, for example, "sending a key needed for a content exchange to the electronic device."

Instead, *Traw* at least does not disclose any of the aforementioned recitations. For example, *Traw* discloses that the source of the content sends a message containing a key. (See col. 8, lines 33-41.) Once the source in *Traw* has completed the content transmission, the content channel terminates. (See col. 8, lines 48-52.) In *Traw*, the content source does not receive the key (e.g. from a controller), rather the content

source itself creates and sends the key. Accordingly, independent Claims 1, 2, 8, and 9 each patentably distinguish the present invention over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claims 1, 2, 8, and 9.

Dependent Claims 3, 6-7, 10, and 13-20 are also allowable at least for the reasons above regarding independent Claims 1, 2, 8, and 9, and by virtue of their respective dependencies upon independent Claims 1, 2, 8, and 9. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 3, 6-7, 10, and 13-20.

## **II. Conclusion**


In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Office Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Office Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: September 9, 2004

By: 

D. Kent Stier  
Reg. No. 50,640  
(404) 653-6559